

VZCZCXYZ0000
PP RUEHWEB

DE RUEHRL #0535/01 0751902
ZNR UUUUU ZZH
P 161902Z MAR 07
FM AMEMBASSY BERLIN
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 7510
INFO RUEHLO/AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY 8063
RUEHMO/AMEMBASSY MOSCOW PRIORITY 1721
RUEHOT/AMEMBASSY OTTAWA PRIORITY 0982
RUEHFR/AMEMBASSY PARIS PRIORITY 8589
RUEHRO/AMEMBASSY ROME PRIORITY 0338
RUEHKO/AMEMBASSY TOKYO PRIORITY 1402

UNCLAS BERLIN 000535

SIPDIS

SENSITIVE
SIPDIS

STATE FOR ISN/CTR, EUR, WHA/CAN, AND EAP/J

E.O. 12958: N/A

TAGS: [PARM](#) [PREL](#) [ETTC](#) [KNNP](#) [CBW](#) [TRGY](#) [GM](#) [JA](#) [RS](#) [CA](#)
SUBJECT: FEBRUARY 27-28 MEETING OF THE G-8 GLOBAL
PARTNERSHIP WORKING GROUP IN BERLIN

REF: BERLIN 244

¶1. (SBU) Summary: The second G-8 Global Partnership Working Group (GPWG) meeting under the German G-8 Presidency took place in Berlin February 27-28. The two days of discussion covered three themes: "Main Achievements Within the Global Partnership," "Experiences and Lessons Learned," and "Developments Since 2002 and Future Priorities Including Geographical Scope." Under achievements, the delegations covered the GP's work during the first five years, emphasizing progress in chemical weapons destruction (CWD) and Russian nuclear submarine dismantlement, GP assistance projects in Ukraine, and re-employment of former weapons scientists through Moscow International Science and Technology Center (ISTC). Under lessons learned, delegations emphasized the importance of close cooperation with local authorities, the success of "piggybacking" new projects through existing country arrangements, getting resource support from donor states for GP projects, and the value of audits to scrutinize project efficiency. Russian and other delegates complained about slowness in implementing some projects, but others cautioned that CWD and submarine dismantlement require careful planning. A German Federal Intelligence Service (BND) representative provided a terrorism threat analysis and a U.S. delegate urged identifying and countering diverse terrorist threats while continuing the work on current GP priorities. Except for Russia, delegations supported expanding the GP's priorities. The Dutch delegate mentioned a donor's meeting for March 12 in The Hague on CWD.

¶2. (SBU) On February 28, the GP partners held a closed session and, with slight differences, highlighted primarily by Russian concerns over the GP ability to sustain its current commitments while pursuing global expansion, reached general consensus on the basic successes and lessons learned to date, and agreement that the GP should attempt to address the evolving challenges that global terrorism presents. End Summary.

First Day's Session

¶3. (SBU) The second meeting of this year's GPWG under the German presidency took place in Berlin February 27-28. Attending the first day's session were representatives of all GP donor states and the regular G-8 partners, in addition to the EU. In all, some 18 presentations were made, including

talks by invited representatives from the International Atomic Energy Agency, the (German) Institute for International and Security Affairs, the German BND, and the U.S. National Academy of Sciences. Participation in the second day's session was limited to G-8 partners. For both days, the Chair divided the presentations and discussion into three themes: "Main Achievements with the Global Partnership," "Experiences and Lessons Learned," and "Developments Since 2002 and Future Priorities Including Geographical Scope."

¶4. (SBU) Achievements Within the GP: Gebhard Geiger, from the German Institute for International and Security Affairs, presented a descriptive, neutral overview on what the GP has accomplished during the first five years. Russian delegate Oleg Rozhkov spoke of Russia's commitment to two basic GP priorities. He noted that Russia has received USD 300 million for CWD and USD 493 million for nuclear submarine dismantlement. (Note: Russia's Foreign Ministry reports that the figures are actually USD 297 million for CWD and USD 443 million for submarine dismantlement. End note.) Rozhkov also complained about the slow pace of CWD projects in Russia. The French, Ukrainian, and Canadian delegates all commented positively about progress on their projects. The Canadian Deputy Executive Director of the Moscow International Science and Technology Center, Leo Owsiacki, mentioned ISTC's successful efforts to engage 75,000 scientists, 75 percent of whom are former weapons scientists in the FSU, and noted 470 ISTC partners for research and development projects. Rozhkov succinctly stated his view that the task of redirection of former weapons scientists is "done." Owsiacki responded that ISTC is currently involved in a strategic planning session on moving toward a more commercial role for the ISTC and that research and development efforts are specifically designed to move scientists in that direction.

¶5. (SBU) Experiences and Lessons Learned: UK delegate Berenice Gare cited a report from the British NGO Chatham House that praised the GP's work, but added the NGO considered GP weak on biological warfare issues. Canadian delegate Troy Lulasnyk stated Canada was finding flexibility in funding direct contracts and predicted speedier work on submarine dismantlement during the next five years. The Norwegian delegate also described successful work on the removal of radioisotopic thermoelectric generators (RTGs) and dismantling of Victor class nuclear submarines, but complained of access problems at Mayak and other places in northern Russia. Russian delegate Rozhkov expressed concerns about excessive administrative infrastructures for projects and advised all members that in order to comply with commitments to finish work by 2012, Russia will need all GP (CWD) funds committed and spent by the end of 2009. Rozhkov in this and subsequent discussions discounted occasional complaints about access, noting the GP was "not an occasion for tourism."

¶6. (SBU) Developments Since 2002 and Future Priorities: Several delegates responded to earlier Russian concerns over the slowness of ongoing projects. The Swedish and UK delegates, among others, explained while projects start slowly, most should pick up speed in the second half of the 10-year period. DAS Semmel stated that the U.S. shared Russia's frustration. He noted delays are in some cases traceable to legitimate differences in bidding and contract negotiations, but reiterated U.S. commitment to complete the work. UK delegates cautioned that the dangerous nature of CWD and submarine dismantlement must be preceded by unhurried, careful planning for safety reasons: "You have to get it right before you start."

¶7. (SBU) In his terrorist Threat Analysis Update, Dr. Herrmann of Germany's BND asserted that while the nuclear capability of terrorist organizations is not yet apparent, their capabilities in the areas of chemical and biological weapons are growing. Hermann was followed by a provocative, well-received presentation entitled, "Global Partnership, Business as Usual, or Responding to New Challenges," by Anne

Harrington, Director of the Committee on International Security and Arms Control at the U.S. National Academy of Sciences. Through slides depicting the global network of jihad and the future expansion of the use of nuclear power among sovereign states, she underscored the fundamental need for the GP and all organizations working to combat terrorism to identify and counter broad-based terrorist threats that cut across all regions and continents, while, at the same time, continuing collective efforts to finish work on current GP priorities. Anita Nilsson, Director of the Office of Nuclear Security at the IAEA, addressed the theme: "Nuclear Security, Preventing the Threat of Nuclear Terrorism." She also emphasized the critical need to meet the challenge created by the proliferation of nuclear capabilities of states and organizations around the world.

¶8. (SBU) Among the comments from delegations was a detailed statement by Russia's Rozhkov, who reiterated his country's position that the time is not right for "radical changes" in the GP. In response to concerns over the lack of access expressed by the Norwegians and Japanese, Rozhkov claimed some of his Russian colleagues had complained about unnecessary site visits. He also repeated that Russia wants to see all CWD funds expended by December 31, 2009, in order to complete destruction of CW in Russia by 2012. Japan and Norway defended their concerns over access. DAS Semmel raised the future of the GP up to or beyond 2012, prompting considerable discussion, with most delegates expressing broad agreement that the GP needs to adapt to emerging global threats while also addressing existing priorities in Russia and the FSU. The UK delegates suggested that perhaps by 2010 there will be the need to begin work on the next "Kananaskis" plan. (Note: The GP was first announced at the 2002 G-8 Summit in Kananaskis, Canada. End note.) Other delegates agreed in principle but not necessarily for that specific year. At the meeting's end, the Dutch delegate spoke about a donor's meeting on CWD scheduled for The Hague on March 12.

Second Day's Session

¶9. (SBU) In the second day's session for G-8 partners only, the delegates discussed points made the previous day. The Chair noted for the record that members agreed the GP review would be submitted to G-8 Summit leaders as a stand-alone document. The Chair also distributed a list of points for discussion compiled from the previous day's discussions and from G-8 partner responses to a GP questionnaire circulated in early February. The German Chair agreed with DAS Semmel's snap-shot that this year's GP plans to produce four products for the Summit: the annual report, the annex to the annual report, a stand-alone assessment of the GP, and a short insertion on the assessment for inclusion in the final Heads of State statement at the Summit. UK delegate Gare argued the document needs headline points that encapsulate GP goals and successes. The delegates reached consensus on the summary of GP achievements on issues that ranged from the establishment of coordinating mechanisms for project completion, the establishment of a legal framework that includes procedures for liability, transparency and access, the successful redirection of former weapons scientists and progress toward self-sustainable commercial scientific activities, the extension GP activities to include work in Ukraine, and the acceptance of new participating donor states into the GP.

¶10. (SBU) In the summary of lessons learned, delegates noted the need to reduce bureaucratic obstacles without neglecting financial control or compliance with the national legislation of donor and recipient states, that "piggy-backing" is an appropriate mechanism for combining efforts of donors and partners, and that local cooperation and direct contracting have been identified and helpful for swift and flexible project implementation. They also noted the GP must remain adaptive to new challenges, that consensus must be reached among all participants on project development, and that a

balance must be struck between the protection of sensitive information and the necessary transparency and accountability in project implementation. Russian delegate Rozhkov raised the point of showing the low percentage of pledged funds that have been expended on projects. DAS Semmel was obliged to repeat that statistic cannot work because pledged funds are released in increments in annual budgets and obviously cannot be spent before they are appropriated. He argued a more appropriate statistic would be the percentage of funds spent or obligated among those funds actually available from donor countries. The delegates also determined that long-term planning can be improved for the second five years of the GP if recipient and donor states are given an appropriate amount of time for preparation to identify potential gaps in program needs so that additional program contributions can be sought.

¶11. (SBU) The delegates reached a broad consensus on the summary of developments since 2002, and, except for Russia, also reached broad consensus on the future of GP priorities. The Russian delegate objected to the need for GP expansion at this time. There was unanimous agreement that all ongoing projects and tasks should be completed. DAS Semmel underscored this point and mentioned that partners can do more to sustain and implement ongoing programs while seeking additional donors. He reminded partners that the Kananaskis document did not limit GP activity to Russia or the FSU and that as the global security environment had evolved in recent years, the GP must adjust by placing greater emphasis on the "global" in the Global Partnership, while not detracting from priority requirements in Russia and the FSU. All delegates also agreed that GP tasks would not disappear after 2012 and that a framework should be developed to address this situation. Several members suggested that the assessment of future directions for the GP might begin in 2010, but the exact time for the assessment was not determined. The group noted the economic situation in Russia has improved since 2002 and applauded Russia's additional pledge of USD 4 billion to ongoing CWD and submarine dismantlement. However, Russian delegates resisted consensus language that referred to growing global concerns over increased terrorism threats.

Comment

¶12. (SBU) There were predictable differences expressed by the Russian delegation over GP expansion and Russian resistance to the efforts of the Germans and other partners to gain GP consensus on the growing global threat of terrorism. However, there was still general consensus among members, including Russia, on other aspects GP achievements, lessons learned, and the need for the GP to adjust to future challenges. The two-day session should facilitate a consensus on the five-year review document. There was a short, pointed exchange of views over access between the Russian and the Norwegian and Japanese delegations, but an overall constructive, congenial working group atmosphere was sustained throughout both days.

¶13. (SBU) The German Chair surprised delegates with the first day's schedule in which Anne Harrington's presentation turned out to be the only briefing given by a non-governmental organization other than the two that the Germans had originally announced weeks ago would participate. We understand that the UK was unable to get a Chatham House representative to the meeting and that others had similar problems. Harrington's presentation was well received in its basic purpose to emphasize the growing global terrorism threat and the need for GP response to this challenge. The presentation by Canada's ISTC Deputy Executive Director Leo Owsiacki also turned out to be particularly useful. Owsiacki spurred comments on redirection of former scientists that allowed partners and donors to hear directly about the success of the center programs and helped air the issue of self-sustainability for the two science centers. The only item that might merit special attention is the GP annex document. Several members commented after the sessions that

preparation of the annex document will be more important this year because of the five-year review. Data on the work and status of projects should be subject to more scrutiny. We have previously emphasized the importance for GP to prepare accurate, comprehensible annex data. End Comment.

¶13. (SBU) Heads of Delegations:

Viktor Elbling, Germany
Benjamin Craig, Australia
Werner Bauwens, Belgium
Troy Lulashnyk, Canada
Ales Macik, Czech Republic
Soren Bollerup, Denmark
Tomas Reyes Ortega, EU Council
Bruno Dupre, EU Commission
Timo Kienanen, Finland
Arnaud Roux, France
Michael Keaveney, Ireland
Antonio Catalano di Melilli, Italy
Takeshi Aoki, Japan
Edwin Keijzer, Netherlands
Robert Kvile, Norway
Agnieszka Walter-Drop, Poland
Kwon Young-dae, Republic of Korea
Oleg Rozhkov, Russian Federation
Jan Lundin, Sweden
Andreas Friedrich, Switzerland
Volodymyr Belashov, Ukraine
Berenice Gare, United Kingdom
Andrew Semmel, USA
Anita Nilsson, IAEA

¶14. (U) This cable was cleared by ISN subsequent to the delegation's departure from Berlin.

TIMKEN JR